

**CITY OF REDMOND  
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
September 7, 2006**

NOTE: These minutes are not a full transcription of the meeting. Tapes are available for public review in the Redmond Planning Department.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:** Dennis Cope, Robert Hall (arrived at 7:17 PM), Lee Madrid, Mery Velastegui and David Wobker

**STAFF PRESENT:** Steve Fischer and Gary Lee, Senior Planners; Asma Jeelani, Assistant Planner

The Design Review Board is appointed by the City Council to make decisions on design issues regarding site planning, building elevations, landscaping, lighting and signage. Decisions are based on the design criteria set forth in the Redmond Development Guide.

**CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order by the Vice Chairperson of the Design Review Board Dennis Cope at 7:05 PM. Design Review Board members David Scott Meade and Sally Promer-Nichols were excused.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MR. WOBKER TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 7:06 PM. MOTION CARRIED (3-0).**

**PRE-APPLICATION**

**PRE060045, Microsoft Building 120**

**Description:** Minor addition plus mechanical screening to existing two-story 19,362 square foot office building

**Location:** 15320 NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street

**Applicant:** Brenda Ross with KDW Architects

**Staff Contact:** Asma Jeelani, 425-556-2443

Ms. Jeelani presented the staff report on the remodeling and renovation of an existing building on the Microsoft campus. The applicant is proposing to take out an entrance and make a more identifiable front door, and also to take out some of the windows and replace them with vertical siding. Staff is proposing that they add other windows and also a landscape island in the parking lot.

Brenda Ross, KDW Architects, 10202 5<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, Seattle, WA 98125, explained that the proposal is a fairly small addition to an existing building, which has two very strong masonry stair towers adjacent to each other and a second story of black glazing. The building is very small relative to the nearby buildings; for example, Buildings 121 and 122 are four stories and very similar in that they have large horizontal banding with white and black glazing. The intent of the original design is that the second floor would appear to float. She had photographs of the existing building. She went over the site plan of the area. She noted that there would be no articulation on the rooftops. The building houses Microsoft Global Security Operations for all of Microsoft's campuses nationally and internationally. The intent is for this to be a lower profile building so that it is not obvious security is located there. The first floor has an emergency hub area. They have downplayed the building and tried to maintain its original massing to keep it low profile. She had hoped to have a metal canopy that went with the metal siding, but found difficulty in getting any substantial canopy over this heavy door. Instead, she brought the texture and color change into the new door area. They could upgrade some of the hardscape in the front to better identify the foot traffic area, and could also articulate some of the landscaping design.

Mark Brumbaugh, Brumbaugh & Associates, 600 N 85<sup>th</sup> Street #102, Seattle, WA 98103, commented that this is different from typical Microsoft buildings that interact with other buildings. Microsoft does not want to encourage people to come here. This will be a very quiet building with an important security purpose. There will be no connectivity to other buildings established for this building. He explained that the current

site is over 20 years old, so is not up to the current landscaping code. They are not trying to make a landscape statement, but to bring it up to code. They will probably replace the irrigation system.

(Mr. Hall arrived at 7:17 PM.)

Ms. Ross continued her presentation by describing the rooftop screening of the large, 8-foot-tall cooling units on the roof. They do not believe that the height of the screen wall will be observed as a third story. The screen wall is also 8 feet high. Traditionally, Microsoft downplays its screening by making it as neutral as possible—except for this building. The screening mimics the rhythm of the building. Any views from NE 40<sup>th</sup> Street are well landscaped and fully screened. The most visible side to foot traffic is the back of the building. The view from SR 520 is the most open elevation. SR 520 is approximately 40 feet below the building. While it is hard to see the building from SR 520 itself, there is building visibility from the off ramps. They would propose bringing the coping at the top of the metal screen to 18 inches and create a horizontal band at the top of the screen wall. If they weighted the top of the banding, they could hold it down some.

#### **COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS**

Ms. Velastegui:

- Thought it a good idea to make a statement with paint color or material to help people identify the entrance to the building.
- Commented that on A-7 the screen at one point is at least 20 feet from the edge of the building. A pedestrian looking from below would not see the 8-foot screen.
- Asked to see the color of the materials.
- Confirmed that metal siding was used on A-9, 10 and 11.
- Confirmed that the two towers would retain the same as the applicant would only wash the natural-faced CMU.

Mr. Wobker:

- Commented that Staff Recommendations 3, 4, 7, 10, 11 and 12 are not an issue to him.
- Commented that Staff Recommendations 5 and 6 are probably okay too.
- Thought the applicant's and staff's rationale on Staff Recommendations 1 and 2 made sense.
- Was concerned in Staff Recommendation 8 with the material of the security fence, which is 5/8-inch black mesh, but should be solid screening. (The applicant responded that they chose to downplay the screening by going with a security mesh. Otherwise would look like a substantial addition to the building. Could downplay the feeling of mass within the screening, as they would not be visible from the roads.)

Mr. Hall:

- Did not see anything on which he would have an issue.

Mr. Cope:

- Understood the entry issue from a security standpoint, but this dictates that no one would want to hang out there.
- Should know where the front door is located. Landscaping could do that; would not have to be done architecturally. Could move the one aisle and combine it with a double-wide to give a front door area where some formal landscaping could be done to signify a front entrance.
- Said he would have a hard time with approving trash enclosures that are substandard because people do not see them. Would prefer to see a solution that does not enclose the area.
- Noted that on sheet 10 the drawing has a sample for material #2, but the key does not include that.
- Thought what they are doing architecturally is fine
- Did not have a problem with the roof screen, but would side with Ms. Velastegui to have a deeper cap.
- Recommended not painting out the doors to the same color as the split face and not to paint them dark.

- Staff Recommendation 1: Suggested that something needs to be done but keep the landscaping small.
- Staff Recommendation 2: Commented that a modest change in the detailing could accomplish that.
- Agreed with Mr. Wobker on the other staff recommendations.
- Said he would have to be convinced on Staff Recommendation 8.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MS. VELASTEGUI AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO REOPEN THE MEETING AT 7:45 PM. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

## **MINUTES**

### **July 20, 2006:**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. HALL AND SECONDED BY MS. VELASTEGUI TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD JULY 20, 2006, MEETING MINUTES AS SUBMITTED. MOTION CARRIED (2-0-2), WITH MR. WOBKER AND MR. COPE ABSTAINING.**

### **August 3, 2006:**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. WOBKER AND SECONDED BY MR. HALL TO APPROVE THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD AUGUST 3, 2006, MEETING MINUTES AS SUBMITTED. MOTION CARRIED (3-0-1), WITH MS. VELASTEGUI ABSTAINING.**

### **August 17, 2006:**

Mr. Cope retracted all his comments from this meeting. These minutes were tabled until both Mr. Cope and Mr. Madrid could be present, as they were the only Design Review Board members present at the August 17 meeting.

## **APPROVAL**

### **L060101, Banner Bank**

**Description:** Drive-thru and trash enclosure improvements

**Location:** 7950 164<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant Request:** Approval of landscape plan with conditions

**Staff Recommendation:** Approval with conditions

**Prior Review Date(s):** 07/06/06

**Architect:** Mel Easter with Johnson Braund Design Group

**Staff Contact:** Gary Lee / 425-556-2418

Gary Lee, Senior Planner, reported that the applicant is agreeable to replacing Kinnikinnick with Chilean Strawberry for the ground cover.

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. HALL AND SECONDED BY MR. WOBKER TO APPROVE L060101, THE BANNER BANK DRIVE-THROUGH ADDITION AND COLOR CHANGE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN WITH CONDITION #1 TO SUBSTITUTE CHILEAN STRAWBERRY AS THE GROUND COVER. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. HALL AND SECONDED BY MS. VELASTEGUI TO CLOSE THE MEETING AT 7:52 PM. MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

## **REPORTS**

**Sustainability:** Mr. Cope expressed his keen interest in the City doing much more than it has been doing on sustainability. He inquired if the board members would be interested in having a special meeting to talk about the topic of "What is Sustainability and What Are Other People and Cities Doing?" He wants to put the Mayor and City Council on notice that the Design Review Board is serious about sustainability.

### **PRE-APPLICATION**

#### **PRE060047, Riverwalk at Redmond LLC**

**Description:** Change in color to exterior of buildings, replace windows, and add new architectural details

**Location:** 15825 Leary Way

**Applicant:** Kim Steward

**Staff Contact:** Asma Jeelani, 425-556-2443

Asma Jeelani, Associate Planner, introduced this pre-application to modify the exterior of these five apartment buildings being converted to condominiums. The applicant was not present. When contacted by phone, the applicant commented that she did not know she was supposed to be present. At the suggestion of staff, the Design Review Board reviewed this without the applicant's presence. The applicant wants to uplift the exterior facades, changing the roof color to black, using different combinations of being, sand and tan for the colors, and adding new windows. There are no trash enclosures, and the residents take trash cans into the parking lot for trash pickup, so staff recommends the addition of trash enclosures. The applicant wants to remove five significant trees, and staff has requested more information about this. The apartments were originally permitted to have carports for all units, and the applicant plans to add the remaining carports.

### **COMMENTS FROM THE DRB MEMBERS**

Mr. Wobker:

- Was concerned that the applicant is removing five significant trees for no apparent reason.
- Advised the applicant to be sensitive to the buildings backing up onto a major trail system.

Mr. Hall:

- Supported Mr. Wobker's issue about the trees and wanted to know why they were being removed.
- Commented that he would like to see a diagram of the site and the elevations of a typical building. Also an example of the roofing materials.
- Thought the applicant should have submitted a proper packet of documents.

Mr. Cope:

- Echoed everything that Mr. Wobker and Mr. Hall commented.
- Agreed with staff that the six-inch window treatment is too heavy and four inches would be better.
- Agreed with staff that trash enclosures must be provided.
- Agreed that designs and locations of buildings and carports should have been provided.

The Design Review Board was in agreement with staff's recommendations.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**IT WAS MOVED BY MR. HALL AND SECONDED BY MR. WOBKER TO ADJOURN AT 8:12 PM.  
MOTION CARRIED (4-0).**

---

**MINUTES APPROVED ON**

---

**RECORDING SECRETARY**